BEFORE

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF

SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 2013-201-WS

| | IN RE: | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | Carol charg | cation of Utilities Services of South,) ina, Inc. for adjustment of rates and) es and modifications to certain terms) onditions for the provision of) and sewer service.) STEVEN LUBERTOZZI | | | | |
| 1 2 | Q. | WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, OCCUPATION AND BUSINESS | | | | |
| 3 | | ADDRESS FOR THE RECORD? | | | | |
| 4 | A. | My name is Steven M. Lubertozzi. I am employed as the Chief Regulatory | | | | |
| 5 | | Officer at Utilities, Inc., ("UI") through its shared services organization, 2335 Sanders | | | | |
| 6 | | Road, Northbrook, Illinois 60062. | | | | |
| 7 | Q. | ARE YOU THE SAME STEVEN LUBERTOZZI THAT FILED DIRECT | | | | |
| 8 | | TESTIMONY IN THIS DOCKET? | | | | |
| 9 | A. | Yes, I am. | | | | |
| 10 | Q. | PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE ISSUES YOU WILL BE ADDRESSING? | | | | |
| 11 | A. | The cost of debt used by ORS witness Gearheart, the overall revenue requirement | | | | |
| 12 | | if the Commission were to accept all of ORS' adjustments and the historical financial | | | | |
| 13 | | performance of Utilities Services of South Carolina, Inc. (hereinafter "USSC"). | | | | |
| 14 | Q. | WHAT ISSUES DO YOU HAVE WITH THE COST OF DEBT USED BY ORS | | | | |
| 15 | | WITNESS IVANA GEARHEART? | | | | |

Ms. Gearheart uses a cost of debt rate of 6.58%, which is .02% below UI's actual cost of debt. Ms. Gearheart provided no evidence or support in her Direct Testimony and Exhibits that would indicated that the full cost of debt of 6.6% is inappropriate or imprudent. On July 19, 2006 UI entered into a Master Note Purchase Agreement, wherein \$180,000,000 of collateral trust notes were issued at 6.58%. The additional .02% represents costs to acquire the debt.

A.

Q.

A.

0.

A.

WHAT TYPES OF COSTS WERE INCURRED TO ACQUIRE THE DEBT?

In order to acquire the \$180,000,000 of debt at 6.58%, a rate that was in line with market rates when it was acquired in 2006, UI had to engage lawyers, consultants, tax advisors and incurred fees and costs. These costs incurred by UI are similar, but not exactly the same, as costs a homeowner would include to refinance a home mortgage. It would be completely imprudent for any company to acquire any debt without the assistance of lawyers, tax advisors and consultants.

ARE THESE COSTS SOMETIMES REFERRED TO AS FLOTATION COSTS?

Often, the costs incurred by publicly traded companies to issue securities are referred to as flotation costs. The costs at issue in this case, however, were incurred in connection with a debt issuance and the term flotation cost does not fully reflect what these costs really are and why they were incurred. I prefer to refer to these as costs incurred to acquire UI's long-term debt.

Q. HOW MUCH DID UI INCUR TO ACQUIRE THE \$180,000,000 LONG-TERM DEBT?

| 1 | A. | UI incurred approximately \$1.3 million, which is less that 1% of the |
|----|----|---|
| 2 | | \$180,000,000 offering. These costs are amortized over the term of the loan agreement, |
| 3 | | which is 30 years, so UI expenses approximately \$42,000.00 per year. |
| 4 | Q. | HOW DID YOU ARRIVE AT 6.6% IF THE STATED INTEREST RATE IS |
| 5 | | 6.58%? |
| 6 | A. | UI makes semiannual interest payments in January and July of each year and each |
| 7 | | payment is \$5,922,000, calculated below: |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | \$180,000,000 * 6.58% * ½ = \$5,922,000 |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | Therefore, UI pays annual interest expense of \$11.844 million. |
| 12 | | UI incurred approximately \$1.3 million in fees and costs to acquire the |
| 13 | | \$180,000,000. These fees are amortized over the life of the loan, which is 30 years or |
| 14 | | \$42,000 of amortization expense per year. |
| 15 | | USSC added the \$42,000 of amortization expense to the annual interest expense |
| 16 | | of \$11.844 million which totals \$11.886 million of annual prudently incurred expense. |
| 17 | | The calculation to obtain the 6.60% is provided below: |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | Annual expense: $$180,000,000 * 6.58\% + $42,000 = $11,886,000$ |
| 20 | | Annual cost rate: $$11,886,000 / $180,000,000 = 6.60\%$ |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | Q. | HAVE ALL OF USSC'S SISTER COMPANIES OUTSIDE OF SOUTH |
| 23 | | CAROLINA RECOVERED THESE COSTS? |

| 1 | A. | Yes, when filing rate cases for other UI operating companies, we routinely |
|----|----|--|
| 2 | | include the costs to acquire the \$180,000,000 and they have been routinely accepted by |
| 3 | | the parties and included in rates by the Commissions in other jurisdictions (e.g., North |
| 4 | | Carolina, Illinois, and Nevada). |
| 5 | Q. | IN YOUR OPINION WHAT IMPACT WOULD THE EXCLUSION OF THESE |
| 6 | | COSTS HAVE? |
| 7 | A. | There will be several impacts. The first one would be that USSC would never |
| 8 | | earn its authorized return, because the full cost of its debt will not be factored into rates. |
| 9 | | Second, unrecovered costs could cause future interest rates available to UI (and other |
| 10 | | utilities) to increase, because lending institutions will know that costs to acquire debt will |
| 11 | | be at risk of not be recovered by customers. |
| 12 | Q. | IN YOUR OPINION SHOULD THE COSTS INCURRED TO ACQUIRE THE |
| 13 | | \$180 MILLION OF LONG-TERM DEBT BE INCLUDED FOR RATEMAKING |
| 14 | | PURPOSES? |
| 15 | A. | Absolutely, UI incurred these cost and there is no evidence to suggest that these |
| 16 | | costs were imprudently incurred. |
| 17 | Q. | IF THE COMMISSION WERE TO ACCEPT ALL OF ORS' ADJUSTMENTS |
| 18 | | AND USE THE MIDPOINT OF ITS ROE RANGE WHAT WOULD BE THE |
| 19 | | RESULTING REVENUE REQUIREMENT? |
| 20 | A. | The resulting revenue requirement using all of ORS' adjustments is \$986,000. |
| 21 | | However, for the reasons discussed in UI's rebuttal testimony, the Commission should |
| 22 | | not accept the ORS's proposed adjustments. |
| 23 | Q. | PLEASE DISCUSS USSC'S OVERALL FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE AND |

1 HEALTH.

As shown in PMA-2, Schedule 1R, Page 2 of 2 USSC financial performance for the past 10 years has been abysmal. The exhibit is provided in its entirety below:

Exhibit PMA-2 Schedule 1R Page 2 of 2

<u>Utilities Services Of South Carolina, Inc.</u> Revenues and Net Income for the years 2003 - 2012

| Year | _ | Revenue | Net Income (Loss) | |
|------|----|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
| | - | | | |
| 2003 | \$ | 2,283,798 | \$ | 77,204 |
| 2004 | \$ | 2,333,013 | \$ | (17,815) |
| 2005 | \$ | 2,286,913 | \$ | (430,003) |
| 2006 | \$ | 2,878,460 | \$ | (245,379) |
| 2007 | \$ | 2,904,417 | \$ | (184,474) |
| 2008 | \$ | 3,526,910 | \$ | 578,559 |
| 2009 | \$ | 3,405,071 | \$ | 101,273 |
| 2010 | \$ | 3,309,064 | \$ | 47,139 |
| 2011 | \$ | 3,340,345 | \$ | (463,172) |
| 2012 | \$ | 3,247,495 | \$ | (172,867) |

Source of Information: Company provided

5

6

7

8

9

10

4

USSC has lost money every year except 2010, 2009, 2008 and 2003. While losing money is most years, USSC continued to deploy capital. USSC's plant balance increased by more than \$9,000,000 since acquisition. If USSC was a standalone entity it would: (1) not be able to meet its obligations as they come due, (2) not be able to attract debt without paying an excessively high interest and (3) would not be able to attract equity.

11 Q. HOW CAN THE COMMISSION SET USSC'S RATE OF RETURN IN ORDER Page 5 of 7

THAT IT IS ALLOWED TO BE A FINANCIALLY STRONG UTILITY OPERATING IN SOUTH CAROLINA?

A.

A.

The Commission should set USSC's ROE at the top of the witness D'Ascendis' range not the bottom of Dr. Carlisle's range as the ORS recommends. USSC had multiple rate increases in the past. However, due to continue upward pressure on expenses and continued capital deployment, USSC has negative free cash flow. As shown by actual operating results, the regulatory process is inadequate by design.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT YOU MEAN WHEN YOU SAY THAT THE REGULATORY PROCESS IS INADEQUATE BY DESIGN.

The parties in most rate cases in South Carolina spend excessive amounts of rate case expense to litigate issues related to the cost of capital, particularly cost of equity. In this case, we are arguing over whether USSC should be authorized an 8.86% ROE, which would be the lowest ROE in recent history, or 10.70%, which is near the top of Mr. D'Ascendis' range. However, at the end of the day, those arguments are moot if the company has zero chance of actually earning its authorized ROE. The Commission, USSC, ORS, and customers would all be better off if rates were set at a level that allows a company to have positive earnings. However, this can only happen through the implementation of best practices, which acknowledges the fact that a regulated water utility cannot earn its authorized return, which is further complicated in South Carolina if a regulated water/wastewater company cannot include its true cost of debt or actual rate case expense. Without these USSC will be forced to file rate cases on a more frequent basis, which only cause rates to increase. Furthermore, UI can't continue to subsidize USSC without a predictable regulatory compact.

Q. PLEASE EXPLAIN THE PROCESS THAT USSC DEVELOPED TO TRACK UNACCOUNTED FOR WATER TO TRACK THE 10% TRESHOLD.

A. When the 10% threshold became effective in 2013 USSC created a Standard Operating Procedures ("SOP") to track unaccounted for water for subdivisions that purchase water. USSC's plan was to track purchased water over a six-month period and provide refunds in the following quarter. The SOP is attached at Exhibit SML – 1.

Q. WHAT WERE THE RESULTS OF THE FIRST SIX MONTHS?

The results of our analysis indicated that for the first six months that the following subdivisions needed adjustment to their bills. USSC is in the process of verifying this information and plans to implement the adjustment to current customers during their next regular scheduled billing.

| Sub# | Subdivision | Gallons |
|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|
| 040 | Calhoun Acres | 466,075 |
| 167 | Hidden Lake | 257,541 |
| 429 | Towncreek Acres | 19,935 |
| 102 & 342 | Dutch Village and Raintree | 1,336,714 |
| 456 | Vanardsdale | 76,970 |
| 012 | Barney Rhett | 359,483 |

12

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

A.

13 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY?

14 A. Yes it does.

USSC Purchased Services Tracking SOP

The tracking process has been set up to determine if we are over billing our customer's for purchased services. Per the commission order: "The Utility shall limit the amount of non-account water charges to customers not to exceed 10% of total water purchased from the governmental body or agency, or other entity. Water loss due to leaks and routine flushing must be accounted for and thoroughly documented by detailing location, timeframe and reason for leak or flushing."

The tracking file will be analyzed semi-annually and any subs for which we have overbilled per the above criteria will have the consumption amount from next vendor invoice reduced by the overbilled consumption. Total allocated 5 amount to customers will be reduced accordingly. Please note: This process is effective Feb 12, 2013

Find Most Recent Files Here

The most recent tracking file will be found as follows:

\\dc0nas001\files.uiwater.com\Rate Case\South Carolina\071-Util Serv of SC\USSC Purchased Water\USSC Purchased Services Tracking

Billing Department Files:

\\dc0nas001\files.uiwater.com\Rate Case\South Carolina\071-Util Serv of SC\USSC Purchased Water\USSC Purchased Services Tracking\Billing Dept Files

\\dcOnas001\files.uiwater.com\Operations Reporting\Monthly Water Acct Forms\Monthly Water Acct Form - SE - SC.xism

USSC Purchased Services Tracking File

The purpose of this file is to summarize and track the USSC purchased services in an organized manner

The 'Summary' tab will highlight which subs (if any) should receive a credit due to overbilling

Updating the file:

Create a new tab for the Billing Dept file under Purchased Water Billings Section

Tabs should be labeled sequentially

Hard code the Operations file for each sub under their respective tab within the Water Acct Forms section

Go back to the Tables by Sub section

Insert 3 rows per month of update, each one below the most recent detail in the Vendor (red), CC&B (blue), Water Loss (orange) tables

Unhide column A

For both the Vendor table and the CC&B table, type the new tab name for the new Purchased Water Billings File. 'xxxxx'!

Drag cells down from the most recent detail outside of the tables in order to populate the new row, hide row A

Summary tab will populate with new data, review any red cells which indicate we need to issue a credit

Discussion of Threshold Calculation:

All vendor invoices (allocated amounts) and CC&B invoices (consumptions amounts) will have gallonage allocated to calander month (done on individual sub tabs)

Operations detail (accounted for use/loss) is already organized by calander month.

The Threshold is = to 10% of the vendor invoice + CC&B consumption + accounted for use/loss If the invoiced/allocated amount is > Threshold amount, a credit of the difference is suggested

Issuing a credit:

If a cell indicated we need to issue a credit and we have completed the billing cycle please review all inputs for accuracy.

If all inputs hold to be True, we will reduce the next vendor invoice by the necessary amount

The necessary refund amount will be the consumption difference between Invoiced/Allocated and Threshold (highlighted in red) * the effective rate per vendor invoice

In instances where we have overbilled and a new rate has been effective (and approved) within the 6-month period, we will refund the consumption at the new rate

In instances where we have overbilled and a new rate has either not been approved or was not effective within the 6-month period, we will refund the consumption at the old rate

Purchased Water Billings File

The purpose of these files is to track the pass-through consumption and compute a bill factor amount, which is used to calculate customer bills

These files will be updated by billing once regulatory dept has determined which vendor rates can be passed to customers

Columns should be organized as follows:

B: Invoice Adjusted/Allocated \$ amount

C: CC&B consumption

L: Sub number

O: Vendor Invoice Date

Q: Vendor ID

T: JDE Doc number for vendor invoice

V: Invoice Start date (service period)

W: Invoice End date (service period)

Cells

M2: CC&B Bill Date

L4: CC&B Start Date (service period)

M4: CC&B End Date (service period)

Monthly Water Acct Form

The purpose of this file is to track the approved water usage and accounted for loss, by month, by sub This process considers approved water usage and accounted for loss as passable uses

Rows should be organized as follows:

86: Total Authorized Water Usage

99: Total Identified Water Losses

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned, Scott Elliott, of Elliott & Elliott, P.A., does hereby certify that he has this date served the below-listed parties with a copy of the pleading(s) indicated below by electronically mailing a copy of same to each of the parties per the Stipulation of Electronic Service entered into by the parties on September 5, 2013:

Re: Application of Utility Services of South Carolina, Inc. for Adjustment of Rates and Charges and Modification of Certain Terms and Conditions for the Provision of Water and Sewer Service

Docket No. 2013-201-WS

PARTIES SERVED:

Jeffrey M. Nelson, Esquire Florence P. Belser, Esquire Office of Regulatory Staff 1401 Main Street, Suite 900 Columbia, SC 29201

PLEADING:

Rebuttal Testimony of Steven Lubertozzi

Scott Elliott, Esquire Elliott & Elliott, P. A. 1508 Lady Street Columbia, SC 29201

October 16, 2013